

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 12-7692**

---

STEVIE AIKEN,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

COLLETON COUNTY DETENTION CENTER; CORPORAL GRANT; OFFICER  
COOK; OFFICER ROBERTS; DEPUTY LANCE; CHARLES FEASER,

Defendants - Appellees.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of  
South Carolina, at Anderson. Joseph F. Anderson, Jr., District  
Judge. (8:12-cv-00205-JFA)

---

Submitted: February 15, 2013

Decided: February 27, 2013

---

Before KEENAN, DIAZ, and FLOYD, Circuit Judges.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Stevie Aiken, Appellant Pro Se. Matthew David Cavender,  
Marshall Hodges Waldron, Jr., GRIFFITH, SADLER & SHARP, P.A.,  
Beaufort, South Carolina, for Appellees.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Stevie Aiken appeals the district court's order denying relief on his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (2006) complaint. The district court referred this case to a magistrate judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C.A. § 636(b)(1)(B) (West 2006 & Supp. 2012). The magistrate judge recommended that relief be denied and advised Aiken that failure to file timely and specific objections to this recommendation could waive appellate review of a district court order based upon the recommendation.

The timely filing of specific objections to a magistrate judge's recommendation is necessary to preserve appellate review of the substance of that recommendation when the parties have been warned of the consequences of noncompliance. Wright v. Collins, 766 F.2d 841, 845-46 (4th Cir. 1985); see also Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140 (1985). Aiken has waived appellate review by failing to file specific objections after receiving proper notice. Accordingly, we affirm the judgment of the district court. We deny Aiken's motion for the appointment of counsel, his motion for transcripts at Government expense, and his motion to reinstate his action.

We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials

before this court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED